

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

# PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
see form PCT/ISA/220

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**  
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.  
PCT/EP2004/010929

International filing date (day/month/year)  
30.09.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)  
08.10.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
G07F17/32

Applicant  
NOVOMATIC AG

### 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

### 2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

### 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2  
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas  
Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl  
Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Authorized Officer

Espuela, V

Telephone No. +31 70 340-3272



---

**Box No. I Basis of the opinion**

---

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.  
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material:  
☐ a sequence listing  
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material:  
☐ in written format  
☐ in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing:  
☐ contained in the international application as filed.  
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.  
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/EP2004/010929

---

**Box No. II Priority**

---

1. ☒ The following document has not been furnished:

☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).

☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. ☐ It has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim because a copy of the priority document was not available to the ISA at the time that the search was conducted (Rule 17.1). This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

4. Additional observations, if necessary:

---

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

---

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	2,5
	No: Claims	1,3,4
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-5
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-5
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

**see separate sheet**

---

**Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application**

---

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

**see separate sheet**

**Re Item V**

**Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Reference is made to the following document:

D1: GB-A-2 326 505 (BARCREST LTD) 23 December 1998 (1998-12-23)

D2: WO 03/028829 A (BALLY GAMING INT INC) 10 April 2003 (2003-04-10)

2. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1, 3, 4 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT and the subject-matter of claim 2 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

**2.1 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1**

Document D1 discloses an entertainment machine comprising (page 6, line 16 - page 8, line 22; figures 1, 2):

a doorframe (7), wherein said doorframe (7) includes 2 display means (27, 35), with 1 display means being viewable at a different vertical angle when compared to the other display means (figure 1), with each said display means being affixed to said gaming console (lines 10,11), so as to be viewed through the openings (11, 12) in said doorframe (7) when said doorframe (7) is in a closed position (figure 1).

All technical features of claim 1 are disclosed in document D1, the subject-matter of claim 1 thus not being new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

In case of alternatives whereby at least one of the display means is affixed to the back of the doorframe, the subject-matter of claim 1 would not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT, this construction being already known in the art (see as an example D2, page 4, lines 2-19, figure 1).

## 2.2 DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-4

The additional features of claims 2-4 are:

- Claims 2 and 3 refer to the number of openings in the doorframe, and the position of the displays in said openings. The use of one or more openings as claimed in claims 2 and 3 is nothing more than a constructional detail. Nevertheless, document D1 discloses a gaming apparatus with a doorframe having two openings (page 7, lines 1-3), these two openings positioned as claimed in claim 3.
- Claim 4 claims that when the doorframe is in its open position, there is access to the at least two display means components (D1, figure 2).

Therefore, the subject-matter of claims 3 and 4 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT and the subject-matter of claim 2 is not inventive in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

As explained above with respect to the position of the displays, in case of alternatives whereby at least one of the display means is affixed to the back of the doorframe, the subject-matter of claims 3, 4 would not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

### **Re Item VIII**

#### **Certain observations on the international application**

Claim 5 is not clear in the sense of Article 6 PCT. Claim 5 claims a doorframe for a gaming machine as referred to the accompanying drawings, this in contravention of said Article 6 PCT and Rule 6.2(a) PCT.